UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/046,999	01/16/2002	Mansoor Lakhdhir	AUS920010581US1	6331

7590   01/05/2005

Duke W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER
HONEYCUTT, KRISTINA B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/046,999	LAKHDHIR ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Kristina B. Honeycutt	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the c ver sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 January 2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-45* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *4,6,8,10,20,22,24,26,36,38,40 and 42* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 April 2002* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/15/2002*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Application filed January 16, 2002;

I.D.S. filed April 15, 2002.

2.   Claims 1-45 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, 17, 30 and 33 are

independent claims.

Drawings

3.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the

description: 616 in Figure 6. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR

1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the

description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action

to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet

should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet,

even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled

"Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct

any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office

action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: 701 on page 18, line 1. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

5.   Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 4 states "... a number of columns, and a format...". It is unclear as to what is meant by the claim but for purposes of examination is understood to read "...a number of columns, or a format ...". Claims 20 and 36 are objected to along the same rationale.

6.   Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 4 states "... button, heading, and title...". It is unclear as to what is meant by the

claim but for purposes of examination is understood to read "... button, heading, or

title...". Claims 22 and 38 are objected to along the same rationale.

7.   Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 4 states "... Wireless Markup Language (WML), and Standard Generalized...". It

is unclear as to what is meant by the claim but for purposes of examination is

understood to read "...Wireless Markup Language (WML), or Standard Generalized ...".

Claims 24 and 40 are objected to along the same rationale.

8.   Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 4 states "... client-side script and a server...". It is unclear as to what is meant by

the claim but for purposes of examination is understood to read "...client-side script or a

server ...". Claims 26 and 42 are objected to along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9.   Claim 3 recites the limitation "the data storage" in line 1. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claims 19 and 35 are rejected along the

same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10.   Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-13, 17-20, 22-24, 27-29, 33-36, 38-40 and 43-45 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Donohue et al. (U.S. Patent 5987480).

Regarding independent claim 1, Donohue discloses a method of constructing a

structured document, comprising:

- locating a command string within a source document, wherein the command

  string includes an element type and at least one element parameter (col. 7, lines

  45-55; col. 8, lines 15-20, 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15; col. 10, lines 49-55; Figure 4 –

  as demonstrated in the figure and cited text, a "command string" is located that

  contains an "element type" and a "parameter");

- retrieving a base string corresponding to the element type (col. 7, lines 45-55;

  col. 8, lines 3-9, 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15; col. 10, lines 34-37; Figure 4 – as

  demonstrated in the figure and cited text, a "base string" is retrieved); and

- modifying the base string according to the at least one element parameter to

  obtain a rendered string and replacing the command string the source document

  with the rendered string (col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines

  60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9; Figure 4 – as demonstrated in the figure and cited text,

a "base string" is modified to obtain a "rendered string" and the "command string" is replaced).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Donohue discloses the method of claim 1, wherein:

- the base string is retrieved from a data structure (col. 7, lines 35-44; col. 8, lines 3-9 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the "base string" is retrieved from a "data structure").

Regarding dependent claim 3, Donohue discloses the method of claim 2, wherein:

- the data storage includes a database (col. 7, lines 35-44 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the data storage includes a database).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Donohue discloses the method of claim 1, wherein:

- the at least one element parameter includes one of a name, a value, description, a number columns, or a format modifier (col. 7, lines 45-55; col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the "parameter" includes a value).

Regarding dependent claim 6, Donohue discloses the method of claim 1, wherein:

- the element type is one of checkbox, selection, radio button, text area, button, heading, or title (col. 7, lines 45-55; col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 29-32 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the "element type" is a title).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Donohue discloses the method of claim 1, wherein:

- the base string includes tags written a structure markup language (col. 8, lines 10-15; col. 10, lines 10-17 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the "base string" includes tags written a structure markup language).

Regarding dependent claim 8, Donohue discloses the method of claim 7, wherein:

- the structured markup language is one of Hypertext Markup Language (HTML), Extensible Markup Language (XML), Wireless Markup Language (WML), or Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML) (col. 8, lines 10-15; col. 10, lines 10-17 – as demonstrated in the cited text, the structured markup language is HTML).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Donohue discloses the method of claim 1, wherein:

- modifying the base string according to the parameters to obtain a rendered string includes replacing a substring within the base string with one of the element parameters (col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines 60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9 – as demonstrated in the cited text, modifying the "base string" includes replacing a "substring" with a "parameter").

Regarding dependent claim 12, Donohue discloses the method of claim 1, wherein

modifying the base string according to the parameters to obtain a rendered string

includes:

- using one of the element parameters to retrieve a replacement substring from a

  database (col. 7, lines 35-44; col. 8, lines 3-9 – as demonstrated in the cited text,

  a "substring" is retrieved from a database); and

- replacing a substring within the base string with the replacement substring (col.

  8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines 60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9 – as

  demonstrated in the cited text, a "substring" is replaced).

Regarding dependent claim 13, Donohue discloses the method of claim 1, further

comprising:

- storing the source document for retrieval by a web server (col. 6, lines 41-44 – as

  demonstrated in the cited text, the source document is stored).

Regarding claims 17-20, 22-24 and 27-29, the claims reflect the computer program

product for performing the operations of claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-13 respectively and are

rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 33, Donohue discloses a method of constructing a

structured document, comprising:

- a bus system and a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the

  processing unit includes at least one processor (col. 6, line 67; col. 7, lines 1-7 –

  as demonstrated in the cited text, a "bus" and processing unit is disclosed since

  Donohue discloses a processing unit on a web server that interacts with the

  Internet and it is obvious that the processing unit must be connected to a bus

  which connects to a network since the processing unit downloads packages from

  the Internet and must be connected to a network in order for this to occur);

- locating a command string within a source document, wherein the command

  string includes an element type and at least one element parameter (col. 7, lines

  45-55; col. 8, lines 15-20, 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15; col. 10, lines 49-55; Figure 4 –

  as demonstrated in the figure and cited text, a "command string" is located that

  contains an "element type" and a "parameter");

- retrieving a base string corresponding to the element type (col. 7, lines 45-55;

  col. 8, lines 3-9, 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15; col. 10, lines 34-37; Figure 4 – as

  demonstrated in the figure and cited text, a "base string" is retrieved); and

- modifying the base string according to the at least one element parameter to

  obtain a rendered string and replacing the command string the source document

  with the rendered string (col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines

  60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9; Figure 4 – as demonstrated in the figure and cited text,

  a "base string" is modified to obtain a "rendered string" and the "command string"

  is replaced).

Regarding claims 34-36, 38-40 and 43-45, the claims reflect the data processing

system for performing the operations of claims 2-4, 6-8 and 11-13 respectively and are

rejected along the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 5, 14, 21, 30 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Donohue et al. (U.S. Patent 5987480) in view of Schneider (U.S.

Patent 6760746).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Donohue discloses does not disclose the parameter

includes a database domain. Schneider teaches including a database domain (col. 9,

lines 11-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the

teachings of Donohue and Schneider before him at the time the invention was made, to

modify the database taught by Donohue (col. 7, lines 35-44) to include a database

domain as taught by Schneider, because including a database domain would enhance

the invention since multiple databases could be utilized and a distinction could be made among them.

Regarding dependent claims 21 and 37, the claims reflect the computer program product and data processing system for performing the operations of claim 5 and are rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding independent claim 14, Donohue discloses inserting a command string into an electronic document, wherein the command string includes a visual element type (col. 8, lines 58-67; col. 9, lines 8-15, 27-29; col. 10, lines 60-67; col. 11, lines 1-9).

Donohue does not disclose the string includes a database domain. Schneider teaches including a database domain (col. 9, lines 11-14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Donohue and Schneider before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the database taught by Donohue (col. 7, lines 35-44) to include a database domain as taught by Schneider, because including a database domain would enhance the invention since multiple databases could be utilized and a distinction could be made among them.

Regarding independent claim 30, the claim reflects an electronic document product in a computer readable medium for performing the operations of claim 14 and is rejected along the same rationale.

12.   Claims 9, 10, 25, 26, 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Donohue et al. (U.S. Patent 5987480) in view of Lakritz (U.S. Patent

6623529).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Donohue discloses a script (col. 7, lines 7-8) but does

not disclose the base string includes an embedded script. Lakritz teaches including an

embedded script (col. 7, lines 50-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art, having the teachings of Donohue and Lakritz before him at the time the

invention was made, to modify the script taught by Donohue to include an embedded

script as taught by Lakritz, because including an embedded script would enhance the

invention since users with varying needs would be able to utilize the invention based on

their preferences and skills.

Regarding dependent claims 25 and 41, the claims reflect the computer program

product and data processing system for performing the operations of claim 9 and are

rejected along the same rationale.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Donohue discloses the script is one of a client-side

script or a server-side script (col. 7, lines 7-8).

Regarding dependent claims 26 and 42, the claims reflect the computer program product and data processing system for performing the operations of claim 10 and are rejected along the same rationale.

13.   Claims 15 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donohue et al. (U.S. Patent 5987480) in view of Schneider (U.S. Patent 6760746) in further view of Becker (U.S. Patent 6301579).

Regarding dependent claim 15, Donohue does not disclose the command string includes a number of columns. Becker teaches including a number of columns (col. 9, lines 48-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Donohue and Becker before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the method taught by Donohue to include a number of columns as taught by Becker, because including a number of columns would enhance the invention since users would know how many columns were present and could easily change the number of columns by modifying the string.

Regarding dependent claim 31, the claim reflects the electronic document product for performing the operations of claim 15 and is rejected along the same rationale.

14.   Claims 16 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Donohue et al. (U.S. Patent 5987480) in view of Schneider (U.S. Patent 6760746)

in further view of Frank (U.S. Pub. No. 20010044813).

Regarding dependent claim 16, Donohue does not disclose the command string

includes a format modifier. Frank teaches including a format modifier (p.10, para. 214).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of

Donohue and Frank before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the

method taught by Donohue to include a format modifier as taught by Frank, because

including a format modifier would enhance the invention since users would know where

the modifications would take place and could easily change the format by modifying the

string.

Regarding dependent claim 32, the claim reflects the electronic document product for

performing the operations of claim 16 and is rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

15.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

- Method and system for generating and serving multilingual web pages (U.S. Pub.

   No. 20030005159),

- Method and apparatus for generating web pages from templates (U.S. Pub. No. 20020059327),

- Method and apparatus for generating dynamic graphical representations and real-time notification of the status of a remotely monitored system (U.S. Pub. No. 20020080938).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristina B. Honeycutt whose telephone number is 571-272-4123. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

STEPHEN HONG,
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

KBH